

The importance of personal values and hospitableness in small foodservice businesses' social responsibility

TOMASELLA, Barbara and ALI, Alisha <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7667-4293>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/23279/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

TOMASELLA, Barbara and ALI, Alisha (2019). The importance of personal values and hospitableness in small foodservice businesses' social responsibility. *Hospitality and Society*, 9 (3), 307-329. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

The importance of personal values and hospitableness in small foodservice businesses' social responsibility

Barbara Tomasella; Alisha Ali

Barbara Tomasella is a Lecturer in Marketing at Derby Business School, with a professional background in CSR, sustainability and marketing. Her research interests include responsible business management, CSR, sustainable tourism and hospitality, and social entrepreneurship. She is a PhD candidate in corporate social responsibility for the foodservice sector at Sheffield Hallam University. She teaches in the areas of Strategic Marketing and Marketing Research.

Dr. Alisha Ali is a Principal Lecturer in Hospitality Business Management at Sheffield Hallam University. Her research focuses on investigating the uses and applications of ICT for sustainable tourism, sustainable development, technology applications and impacts related to tourism and hospitality, innovation in tourism and hospitality, and CSR and online research methods. She teaches and supervises in the areas of innovation, IT, sustainability, CSR, hospitality operations and career management on undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

Abstract: This paper investigates the relationship between personal values, hospitableness and social responsibility in small, independent foodservice businesses. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 24 owner-managers of these businesses located in Sheffield, United Kingdom (UK). The results established that hospitableness is expressed through the way in which these small businesses engage in social responsibility. In lifestyle and family businesses, personal values, such as altruism, friendliness and a passion for food, influence the hospitableness and social responsibility of the small foodservice business. In the long term, social responsibility actions expressing hospitableness add value to the business itself. This research contributes to the hospitality literature, by empirically demonstrating how hospitableness can be expressed through small business social responsibility, which can provide, in the long term, a competitive advantage for small, independent foodservice businesses.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, small business social responsibility, SMEs, entrepreneurship, hospitality industry, foodservice sector, hospitableness.

Introduction

Businesses are perceived as pivotal stakeholders in society (Doh & Guay, 2006; Matten & Crane, 2005), so it is felt that they should provide net positive contributions to it (Carroll, 1991; Wheeler, et al., 2003; Windsor, 2001; Lockett, et al., 2006). This commitment is reflected in the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR). CSR is a contested concept and is being adopted by a growing number of different members of society (Dahlsrud, 2008; Wry, 2009; Garriga & Mele, 2004; Okoye, 2009; Matten & Moon, 2008). For the purpose of this research, CSR is defined as:

“A concept whereby companies integrate social and environmental concerns in their operations and in their interaction with stakeholders on a voluntary basis” (European Commission, 2001, p. 6).

Key tourism organisations have advocated the growth of ethics and CSR within the tourism and hospitality sector: World Tourism Organisation’s Global Code of Ethics was published in 1999 to issue a strong call for more responsible forms of tourism and hospitality (Hawkins & Bohdanowicz, 2012). In the United Kingdom, which is the background context where this research was conducted, CSR has been endorsed by many hotels and other tourism and hospitality businesses, as well as lobby groups, non-governmental organisations and key trade associations (Jones, et al., 2014), such as UK Hospitality (before 2018 known as the British Hospitality Association) and the Sustainable Restaurant Association (British Hospitality, 2017; British Hospitality, 2014; THESRA, 2013). CSR is therefore a dominant feature in the hospitality and tourism literature, with academic studies focusing on the impact that CSR has

on higher financial results being accrued by hospitality and restaurant chains (Inoue & Lee, 2011; Kang, et al., 2010; Lee & Heo, 2009).

The focus of this research is on small independent foodservice businesses, which can be broadly defined, in the context of this study, as small businesses that are not part of a group of restaurants (Estrade, et al., 2014) with a maximum of three locations, which depend on the same manager or chef (Britt, et al., 2011), and employ between 1 and 50 employees. Small businesses represent 72.9% of all foodservice businesses across EU and, as such, account for a 68.8% share of the value added and a 73% share of employment within the EU-27's foodservices sector. In the UK, the proportion of small foodservice businesses compared to large and medium ones is smaller, but nevertheless they account for a 39.5% share of employment and for almost half (46.9%) of the added value within the overall UK foodservice sector (Eurostat, 2016).

Small businesses are present in significant numbers across the whole tourism and hospitality sector (Thomas, et al., 2011) and have an overall significant impact on society and the environment (Hawkins & Bohdanowicz, 2012; Hillary, 2004). These small businesses are therefore considered key to ensuring economic growth, innovation, job creation, environmental protection and social integration (Midttun, et al., 2006; Revell & Rutherford, 2003; Curran, 2000). However, there is a lack of CSR or sustainability studies on small hospitality businesses (Jones, et al., 2016; Farrington, et al., 2017) and small foodservice businesses (Higgins-Desbiolles, et al., 2017; Di Pietro, 2017); therefore, this study addresses this gap in the literature. Moreover, this research is important, as it is predicted that small foodservice businesses will be affected by changes towards more ethical forms of consumption, such as the interest in honest, authentic and sustainable food and experiences (Gilmore & Pine, 2007; Hall & Gossling, 2013), as well as consumers requiring more

transparency in the practices involving food production (British Hospitality, 2017; British Hospitality, 2014).

Many small entrepreneurs are attracted to the foodservice industry because of the low barriers to entry with regards to the initial investment and innovation (Lee-Ross & Lashley, 2010; Morrison & Thomas, 1999), because of the linkages to domestic and food experiences related to the personal life of the individual (O'Mahony, 2003), as well as the possibility of expressing their own creativity and hospitableness (Telfer, 2012). These small businesses, driven by non-economic values, such as lifestyle and family businesses, are often found in the hospitality and foodservice industry (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Getz, et al., 2004; Getz & Petersen, 2005; Chen & Elston, 2013). The entrepreneurship and CSR literature on small hospitality businesses highlight how these types of businesses have an informal business style, as they are heavily influenced in terms of their decision-making by the personal values of the owner (Lee-Ross & Lashley, 2010; Morrison & Thomas, 1999; Getz & Petersen, 2005; Garay & Font, 2012). These lifestyle businesses are characterised by hospitableness, which has at its core ethical values such as generosity and a concern for the needs of others (Di Domenico & Lynch, 2007; Lee-Ross & Lashley, 2010) and can be key to fostering positive guest experiences (Lashley & Chibili, 2018; Lashley, 2017).

Given the significance of engaging with socially responsible practices for small foodservice businesses, as well as the critical role played by hospitableness in the delivery of their offer, this research aims to understand the relationship between personal values, hospitableness and the implementation of socially responsible practices in independent foodservice businesses. It is important to note that, as the focus of this research is on small independent foodservice businesses, the term 'Small Business Social Responsibility' (SBSR) will be adopted rather than CSR, going forwards, to reflect that the term 'corporate' is not applicable to small businesses (Jenkins, 2004; Lepoutre & Heene, 2006). This study is not only important from a

practical and industry-based perspective, but also from an academic perspective, as studies on SBSR in a specific sectorial context are scarce. New context spotting is among the most common incremental types of contribution to academic knowledge (Nicholson et al, 2018). As evidenced in the literature review, no previous studies have attempted to focus on how personal values influence the hospitableness and SBSR of independent foodservice businesses. To achieve the aim, the objectives of this research are:

- 1) To analyse critically how small independent foodservice businesses understand and interpret their social responsibility.
- 2) To explore how personal values motivate the SBSR of independent foodservice businesses.
- 3) To explore how the perceived business benefits influence the SBSR of independent foodservice businesses.

This research contributes to the hospitality literature by engaging with a sociological view of hospitality (Lynch, et al., 2011; Lugosi, 2009; Wood, 2017; Brotherton, 1999; Brotherton, 2017). Hospitableness is a social practice in these small foodservice businesses, characterised by the personal value of responding to human needs (Lynch, et al., 2011); therefore, by empirically exploring SBSR within hospitality, the research provides an understanding of what links hospitableness, personal values and SBSR. Additionally, the research adds value to the emerging and growing field of SBSR research, which is more sensitive to the small-business context and idiosyncrasies (Baumann-Pauly, et al., 2013; Spence, 2016; Soundararajan, et al., 2017; Wickert, et al., 2016), by shedding further light on the relative importance of personal and business motivation during engagement with SBSR, as the literature on this topic currently remains inconclusive.

Literature Review

Small business social responsibility (SBSR)

The SBSR literature emerged from the CSR literature focused on small and medium businesses (Spence, 2016; Spence, 1999; Soundararajan, et al., 2017; Spence & Perrini, 2009), from the small business and entrepreneurship literature, as well as the business ethics literature (Buchholz & Rosenthal, 2005; Spence, 1999; Treviño, et al., 1999; Quinn, et al., 1997). This work utilises the following definition of SBSR:

“SBSR is the social responsibility of a small business for its impact on society, expressed by contributing to the wellbeing of stakeholders and the local community, while minimising the negative impacts on the environment” (Tomasella & Ali, 2016).

The SBSR literature criticises the prevailing view according to which larger corporations are more advanced than small businesses with regards to implementing CSR (Spence, 1999; Perrini, 2006; Jenkins, 2006; Lepoutre & Heene, 2006; Baumann-Pauly, et al., 2013). Such discourses rely on the prevailing economic and instrumental theories of CSR, according to which size and the available resources affect the implementation of CSR practices (ex. Orlitzky, et al., 2011; Brammer, et al, 2009). On the contrary, the literature on SBSR highlights informality as, in small businesses, socially responsible actions are driven by the informal decision-making of the owner-(Lepoutre & Heene, 2006; Murrillo & Lozano, 2006; Baumann-Pauly, et al., 2013). Therefore, this field of research in SBSR has been investigating the ethical outlook of small business owners (Courrent & Gundolf, 2009; Spence, 1999; Spence & Perrini, 2009; Jenkins, 2004; Jenkins, 2006; Jamali, et al., 2009).

Many authors agree that, in small businesses, as the manager focuses on independence and autonomy, it is the owner-manager’s personal values rather than the constraints related to

profit which drive the decision-making in relation to SBSR (Spence, 1999; Lepoutre & Heene, 2006; Jenkins, 2006; Murrillo & Lozano, 2006; Fenwick, 2010; Spence, 2016; Fassin, et al., 2015). Spence and Schmidpeter (2003), Jenkins (2006) and Lepoutre and Heene (2006) found that it is also the physical proximity to stakeholders which is a strong factor contributing to SBSR. Norms and pressures from the community and peers feature among the most important internal drivers for ethics (Brown & King, 1982), therefore what is perceived as the community of reference has an impact on the ethical decisions taken (Lepoutre & Heene, 2006). Recent small business research has suggested that compassion and emotional connections, fostered through physical proximity, have a positive influence on the ethicality of decisions (Mencl & May, 2009).

Finally, several SBSR studies have highlighted that the most engaged companies seem to be those that have adopted a balanced approach between entrepreneurship and ethical practice (Jenkins, 2006; Murrillo & Lozano, 2006; Perrini, et al., 2007; Cambra-Fierro, et al., 2008; Kobeissi, 2009; Castka, et al., 2004; Hammann, et al., 2009). The business benefits that motivate SBSR practice are usually intangible, such as improving the relationships with the closest stakeholders (such as employees, clients and suppliers), encouraging innovative action and increasing the chances of finding growth opportunities, or simply increasing visibility (Jenkins, 2006; Perrini, 2006; Perrini, et al., 2007; von Weltzien Høivik & Shankar, 2011; Williamson, et al., 2006; Lepoutre & Heene, 2006; Spence, 1999). Spence and Schmidpeter (2003), Örtenblad (2016) and Soundararajan et al. (2017), observe that the sectorial context is particularly important in understanding the type of benefits that businesses might achieve through their SBSR practice. The next section therefore looks in detail at those small foodservice businesses that form the objective of this research, to explore further the personal values and entrepreneurial context of the business owner and how these elements influence their SBSR.

Personal values and SBSR in small foodservice businesses

In the hospitality industry, there is a large population of small and micro businesses, which dominate the sector (Thomas, et al., 2011; Chen & Elston, 2013). Often, these small hospitality businesses are characterised by non-economic goals and values (Getz, et al., 2004; Agarwala & Dahm, 2015). Rokeach (1973) defined personal values as enduring beliefs which persist over time, influence behaviour and concern individual or collective well-being. Values and cultural frameworks are important for these businesses and influence their definition of success and business goals, such as seeking autonomy and pursuing a specific lifestyle (Thomas, et al., 2011; Lashley & Rowson, 2010), family values (Agarwala & Dahm, 2015; Ram, et al., 2001), localised, social or community concerns or artistic, spiritual and political values (Keen, 2013; Getz, et al., 2004). Purely financially-driven small foodservice businesses are harder to find, and these seem to be aligned to higher levels of dining (Poulston & Yiu, 2011). It is common for SBSR implementation to be influenced by the alternative non-economical values, such as love or passion for an area, which initiated the tourism business in the first place (Sampaio, et al., 2012; Tzschentke, et al., 2008).

Personal values, rather than cost savings or business advantages, are the primary motivation for environmental or social actions also in independent restaurants (Moskwa, et al., 2015; Carrigan, et al., 2017; Poulston & Yiu, 2011; Alonso-Almeida, et al., 2018). Small independent restaurants, in fact, usually do not register the same cost efficiency as hotels and restaurant chains might, when introducing environmental measures (Revell & Rutherford, 2003; Revell, et al., 2010). These foodservice businesses are particularly affected by high competition and failure rates; independent restaurants face a very competitive environment against the bigger restaurant chains (Parsa, et al., 2015), hence loyal customers and competitiveness are particularly crucial for guaranteeing their business sustainability

(Agarwala & Dahm, 2015). Poulston and Yiu (2011) found that mid-scale organic restaurants integrated their societal and environmental beliefs with their business goals, by taking advantage of the environmental and health food niche to attract customers, and therefore improve profitability. Carrigan et al. (2017) found that small restaurant businesses with authentic lifestyles prioritise the collective interests of the community through their actions for personal reasons, while at the same time pursuing business goals that support their own agenda. Other studies highlight how small restaurants can achieve loyalty and return patronage through focusing on positive actions in support of the local community (Di Pietro & Levitt, 2017; Jang, et al., 2017).

In conclusion, the overview of the literature confirms that the ethics of a small foodservice business are crucial for SBSR; the relationship nature of these businesses not only has an impact on their ethical decisions but can also represent a competitive advantage for the business. This seems particularly plausible in a sector like the foodservice one, which is strongly defined by the social and emotional connotations of the hospitality and food offered, which influence how people perceive and interpret the actions of the business. Therefore, the next sections of the literature review will examine these studies of hospitality in detail, looking at the more ethical and social aspects of hospitality which are related to the personal values of the individual, to argue how this may ultimately be linked to their SBSR.

SBSR and hospitableness in small foodservice businesses

The topic of SBSR is usually considered from the ethical perspective in the hospitality literature. The role of the owner-manager and his/her personal values are crucial in determining the SBSR approach and philosophy (Garay & Font, 2012; Njite, et al., 2011; Tzschentke, et al., 2008; Lashley, 2016; Carasuk, et al., 2016; Carrigan, et al., 2017). In particular, the research has focused on how environmental consciousness (Tzschentke, et al.,

2008) or social norms and altruism (Garay & Font, 2012) drive green actions in small hospitality businesses. Many small businesses in the hospitality field are laden with non-economic and personal values and goals, such as autonomy, family values or specific lifestyles (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Bosworth & Willett, 2011; Velvin, et al., 2016).

In this small business context, which is dominated by personal values, the socio-cultural tradition of hospitality should be taken into consideration as it influences how the business is managed (Lashley, 2007; Lashley & Morrison, 2013). Hospitableness is an essential intangible element of the hospitality experience for the industry, intangible beyond the material side of the goods and services exchanged, and is defined as:

“The willingness to be hospitable for its own sake, without any expectation of recompense or reciprocity” (Lashley, 2015, p. 1).

Lashley and Morrison (2013) describe the social domain of hospitality by considering the social settings in which hospitality takes place, together with the impacts of social forces on the production and consumption of food/drink/accommodation. Telfer (1995) argued that the phenomenon of hospitality has different philosophical connotations, influenced by the historical roots of the concept, which separates it from hospitality management per se. Derrida (2000) discusses hospitality as a national phenomenon of welcoming foreigners. Nowen assimilated the concept with the exchange of friendship in a privileged space (Nowen cited in O’Gorman, 2007). The complex and value-laden nature of small businesses and hospitality, therefore, requires research to have a multidisciplinary breath (Lashley, 2008), which recognises the element of hospitableness as part of it (Lashley, 2015; Lynch, et al., 2011).

Hospitableness should be about genuine and authentic compassion, friendliness and affection when handling guests (Lashley, 2008; Lashley & Chibili, 2018). This dimension of hospitality is closer to the original meaning of the term, which was related to being friendly

and welcoming towards friends and family when they visited a house (Johanson & Woods, 2008). Genuine hospitality, despite its commercial dimension, occurs when there is a real willingness to satisfy the requirements of the clients, irrespective of any repayment (Lashley, 2008; Telfer, 2012). The modern hospitality sector, despite being mainly commercial in nature, nevertheless inherits the industry's service tradition based on the socio-emotional aspects of hospitality (King, 1995; Lashley, 2007; Lashley, 2015). The sociological interpretation of hospitality goes beyond the exchange of products and services, to include the social interactions between hosts and customers (Lugosi, 2008). Poulston (2015) underlines that the distinct hospitality domains, such as the commercial and the socio-emotional, despite being distinct, coexist within the hospitality exchange (Poulston, 2015).

It is also for reasons of distinctiveness and competitiveness that the whole industry continues to focus on fulfilling the socio-emotional needs of the clients (Hemmington, 2007; Ritzer, 2015; Lashley & Chibili, 2018), beyond the commercial exchange. Certain lifestyle businesses are closely related to new forms of tourism consumption and niche markets (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Bosworth & Willett, 2011; Poulston, et al., 2011; Kristian, et al., 2016; Carrigan, et al., 2017). The hospitality industry can therefore be enhanced by kindness, generosity and entertainment, expressed by the host through hospitableness (Lashley & Morrison, 2013; Gehrels, et al., 2017; Lashley & Chibili, 2018). Whilst it is known that the personal values of small business owners influence SBSR, here it is argued that SBSR is also influenced by the hospitableness. As no previous empirical research has examined the relationship between hospitableness and SBSR, although the link between social responsibility and the morality of hospitality has already been supported (Lashley, 2014; Lashley, 2015; Poulston, 2015), this research aims to explore the mechanism that links personal values, hospitableness and SBSR.

Methodology

A qualitative research approach was adopted to explore the personal values and hospitableness driving SBSR in independent foodservice businesses. Soundararajan et al. (2017), Aguinis and Glavas (2012) and Spence (2016) agree that a qualitative approach is best suited for understanding SBSR. The data were collected using semi-structured interviews to tease out an understanding of the phenomenon researched (Silverman, 2015; Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, et al., 2017) and provide small businesses with a voice (Waller et al., 2016), in order better to explore and understand their opinions and motivations (Cassell & Symon, 2004). As the number of small foodservice businesses concerned with social responsibility issues is still emerging (Hawkins & Bohdanowicz, 2012; Di Pietro, 2017), the sample included extreme or critical cases, where the phenomenon of interest is more likely to occur (Flyvbjerg, 2006). The UK forms an ideal context for the sample population of this study, to redress the general lack of studies of CSR in Europe (Coles, Fenclova, & Dinan, 2013).

Sheffield was deemed a good location for this UK-based research as, with a population of 575,400 in mid-2016, the City of Sheffield is England's third largest district authority (Sheffield City Council, 2016); hence, it lies midway between the country's capital and smaller locations in terms of socio-economic variables, with the presence of both independent businesses and chain restaurants (Rimmington & Spencer, 2008). The initial starting point for the choice of establishments was a database of foodservice businesses provided by the Eat Sheffield network, a network project involving independent foodservice businesses facilitated by Sheffield Hallam University (Eat Sheffield, 2012). The task of generating a purposive sample of owner-managers for this study was addressed by conducting a preliminary content analysis of the Eat Sheffield website. Businesses that were included in the sample were those communicating proactively any SBSR practice, such as philanthropy, or actions related to the

environment or community; through further snowball sampling, other businesses were included, such as those that had won special food awards across the city.

The final sample included 24 small independent foodservice businesses, all operating within Sheffield. A total number of 26 interviews were conducted, across 24 businesses; 24 interviews were with the owner-managers, while two further interviews were held with head chefs, based on the suggestion of the owner-managers, as they were responsible for managing food purchases. A pilot study was conducted with an initial group of ten businesses. These pilot interviews allowed clarification of the questions to be asked, the reordering of the questions and the most appropriate interview approach to be selected for these small businesses. The interview themes broadly mirrored the main concepts addressed in the literature review: understanding what SBSR is and how it is peculiar in small businesses; the background of the hospitality business; and personal values and objectives influencing SBSR practices. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the interviews (Braun & Clarke, 2006). When the sample population is pre-determined, as in this case, the results are not generalisable statistically; rather, the analytical generalisability is determined by the strength of the description of the context (Eisenhardt, 1989), for further application of the results to other research contexts (Waligo, et al., 2013).

Results and discussion

Socio-Demographic data

The following table offers a summary of the sociodemographic statistics that best describe these lifestyle and family businesses and their owner-managers. Almost half of the interviewed businesses are cafés (approx. 45%); the second most represented type is restaurants (approx. 33%), while there are a few fast food outlets (8%) and pubs (8%). Most of these businesses (75%) employ fewer than 20 employees, while 25% of the businesses

employ between 20 and 50 employees. In terms of the longevity of the business, the majority (46% approximately) are over 10 years old; 17% of the businesses are start-ups in their first year of operation, while almost 21% are in between their second and fifth year of operation. Of the 24 owner-managers interviewed, approximately 66% were over 40 years old, 25% were between 30 and 40 years old, while only 8% were below 30 years old. In terms of gender, there is a balance between male and female owner managers, with slightly more (54%) owner-managers being male. In the following sections, the owner-manager quotes are related to the code assigned to the specific business, according to the below table; the role is indicated only for interviews with chefs, or with owner-managers that are also chefs in their own business.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the businesses

<i>Type of foodservice establishment and codes</i>		
Type		
Fast food (I2, I7, I14, I15)	3	12.5%
Cafe (I1, I3, I4, I5, I8, I12, I13, I16, I21, I23, I24)	11	45.8%
Pub (I6, I9)	2	8.3%
Restaurant (I9, I10, I11, I17, I18, I20, I22)	8	33.3%
<i>Number of employees</i>		
Number		
0-10	8	33.3%
10-20	10	41.7%
20-40	3	12.5%
40-50	3	12.5%
<i>Duration of operation</i>		
Years		
1 or less	4	16.7%
2-5	5	20.8%
6-9	4	16.7%
10 and over	11	45.8%
<i>Sex (owner manager)</i>		
Male	13	54.2%
Female	11	45.8%
<i>Age (owner-manager)</i>		
Years		
Under 30	2	8.3%
30-40	6	25.0%
40-50	8	33.3%

Hospitableness influences SBSR in foodservice businesses

These lifestyle and family businesses are characterised by their focus on their quality of life (Lashley & Rowson, 2010; Carlsen, et al., 2008) or family life and wellbeing (Agarwala & Dahm, 2015; Ram, et al., 2001; Getz, et al., 2004).

It's not a profit business, it's partly lifestyle, it's a lifestyle choice, choosing to work every single night, it's better than before, we can dictate how to do things (I12).

It's a family business doing things well and being proud about it ... growth is not the objective; it's more about helping other staff to grow (I19)

It was also found that these owner-managers interpret their role in society beyond the material exchange of food and drink, a role that promotes the clients and employees' wellbeing:

It's not about the money, it's about people feeling welcome to come on a personal basis (I15).

What I feel I am doing, is providing the best working environment I can and helping ordinary people through their ordinary life and navigate things (I23, owner and chef).

Such a social role is linked to the physical premises of the businesses, and so also benefits the community:

Well it's a broad function, the aim is that you provide a service, but also a community place (I3).

I think the pub can be at the heart of the community ...It is part of your location...you try to help with things immediate to your vicinity (I23, owner and chef).

It was found that, as a consequence of this personal approach to business, these business owners have a broader understanding of hospitality, that is not limited to the economic exchange of food and drink, but hospitableness (Lashley, 2008; Telfer, 2017), which is about creating social exchanges that add to the wellbeing of others (Lynch, et al., 2011; Lugosi, 2008; Lugosi, 2009; Lugosi, et al., 2009; Telfer, 2017; Wood & Brotherton, 2000). This clearly distinguishes the social role that these businesses perceive as having from their more commercial role, characterised by an economic exchange. This hospitableness is extended to the local community by virtue of the premises.

In these lifestyle and family businesses, it was also found that SBSR is interpreted as being caring towards and supporting those with whom the business deals, which amounts to ethical responsibility:

Responsibility for the people while they are here, for people who work for us, and for the environment or simply personal human impacts...so bottom line is personal responsibility, taking care of your organisation and what it does (I20).

It's being good for our customers but also for our suppliers, and also for the environment and the community we live in (I4, owner and chef).

This type of personal responsibility is ethical in nature, as it depends on the personal values of the owner-manager:

It is about making money in a way that matches our values in which we want to live our lives (I2).

Well it's my duty to other people (I11).

It was found that SBSR is ethical in nature, as it is an expression of hospitableness, founded on the personal values of the business owner; these lifestyle and family businesses are not

driven by growth but focus instead on personal goals, such as caring for people to make them feel welcomed at a personal level. It is known that the hospitableness creates emotional connections (Lashley, 2014; Lashley, 2015); emotions are known to have a positive influence on the ethicality of decisions (Mencel & May, 2009). SBSR is ethical in nature as it is an expression of hospitableness, which is a culturally-embedded social role in society of welcoming people (Lee-Ross & Lashley, 2010; Lashley, 2016) and creating spaces in which people can socialise and care for each other (Lynch, et al., 2011).

The implications of these findings contribute to hospitality theory by showing how an ethical approach to SBSR, which emerged from a sociological view of the industry, should provide the basis for attaining sustainability in the hospitality industry (Lashley, 2014; Cavagnaro, 2017). It contributes to both hospitality and SBSR theory, by explaining that hospitableness influences the perception of SBSR in these small foodservice businesses. SBSR is therefore confirmed as being ethical in nature, as it is an expression of those personal values that also underpin hospitableness. This corresponds to an ethics of care interpretation of SBSR (Spence, 2016; Von Weltzien Høivik & Shankar, 2011), as the business prioritises actions of care that express their hospitableness.

Personal values influence hospitableness and SBSR

First of all, it was found that SBSR is motivated by moral norms, such as integrity, honesty, fairness and politeness, which form part of the culture of the individual and his/her upbringing:

I like to treat people fairly. But I expect to be treated fairly as well. I look for partnerships rather than a crude monetised relationship (I12, owner and chef).

It is because you are dealing with people face to face, you have to have a polite

approach to people (I17, owner and chef).

Moreover, these businesses mentioned altruistic personal values, such as a willingness to be helpful and cooperative:

It's a personality thing, we just like to help people, educate them about food or simply just be able to sit down and relax ... especially if you can't afford it (I14).

The respondents also mentioned the values of happiness, self-worth, belongingness or being friendly and sociable:

I personally like to make people happy... in this business people come here to have a good time, to be happy (I9).

I didn't know that being a business owner would give you that feeling of roots and that sense of belonging...that's got to do with everybody greeting us, supporting us, that's why I want to choose local things and choose to support local businesses...it gives me a real sense of place (I2).

These personal values, underpinning the hospitableness, are frequently found among small lifestyle hospitality businesses (Lee-Ross & Lashley, 2010; Lashley & Rowson, 2010; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Carrigan, et al., 2017; Sweeney, et al., 2018). Friendliness and helpfulness are found in family hospitality businesses, which focus on creating strong social ties within the organisation (Berrone et al., 2012). Finally, a very typical value in foodservice businesses is a passion for food, particularly when shared with others:

I have this interest in food, I always enjoyed the element of food of providing for others, the element of "come and enjoy" (I12, owner and chef).

These self-oriented personal values influence hospitableness and SBSR; focusing on one's

pleasure is a sufficient motive for hospitableness, as the exchange of positive emotions is key to it (Blain & Lashley, 2014; Tasci & Semrad, 2016). It is important to notice how these personal values also contributed towards initiating these small hospitality businesses in the first place. For example, many of the owner-managers mention their passion for food, for culture or for working in a sociable environment, which led them to start the business to pursue that specific lifestyle or passion:

It was something I always wanted to do, I was interested in cooking, always a passionate vegetarian, so I thought of combining the two (I13)

I love it, I have been doing this for 25 years, and you get to know people one by one, recognise numbers when they ring me in to book a table. It gives you the thrill, you know, and the best thing is meeting people (I17, owner and chef).

It was found empirically that personal values, such as altruism, friendliness and a passion for food, together with moral norms, drive the hospitableness and SBSR actions that contribute towards the wellbeing of others; the personal values are particularly important as these are also the values that contribute towards the self-actualisation of the business owner. The hospitableness in a commercial space is usually focused on one's own pleasure beyond the guest's pleasure (Telfer, 2012; Wood, 2017), rather than being aimed at friends. This focus on one's own pleasure and personal values is a distinctive motivation for starting a hospitality business, for business owners who are seeking autonomy and self-actualisation through their businesses (Poulston, 2015; Lashley, 2008); it also confirms that hospitableness can be experienced in a commercial setting (Poulston, 2015; Telfer, 2017).

Knowledge or education about certain socio-environmental issues further directs these owner-managers towards implementing specific proactive SBSR actions or needs at the local level of the business operations:

By focusing on local elements one can be more responsive to actual needs (I3).

A lot of this is due to knowing and collaborating with local not-for-profit projects (I4, owner and chef).

These hospitality businesses, which focus also on actions for the local community, are particularly influenced by their personal knowledge and experiences of the locality. Knowledge and awareness, created through life experiences, are broadly recognised in the CSR literature as essential elements that influence CSR action, by affecting attitudes towards certain behaviour (Demirtas, et al., 2017; Sampaio, et al., 2012). The implication of this second section makes an important contribution to hospitality theory: it was confirmed empirically that it is not only other-oriented values such as altruism or moral norms but also friendliness (Blain & Lashley, 2014; Lashley & Chibili, 2018) or a passion for food (Telfer, 2017) that can influence the hospitableness. The original contribution to hospitality and SBSR theory is demonstrating the influence of personal values on the SBSR of the business, through the effect they have on hospitableness. These findings further contribute to SBSR theory: they support recent research which found that self-enhancement values can coexist with prosocial values in small businesses with an ethical orientation (Power et al., 2017; Schaefer, et al., 2018); this challenges the traditional view that self-enhancement values inhibit social actions (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990).

Perceived business benefits influence SBSR

This final theme is business motivation for SBSR. When asked what motivates SBSR, the respondents also highlighted perceived business benefits as a driver of SBSR. The key element that emerged is the long-term orientation of the business benefits to SBSR practice, as they are not financial but intangible and personal in nature, so it takes time for them to materialise:

We bought the building as we wanted to have freedom and independence to be able to make choices, for example investing in energy efficient equipment; if you are prepared to be in it in the long term, it makes sense to do it (I8).

All of these businesses implement SBSR actions aimed at improving employee well-being, particularly through creating a positive and friendly work environment, as this keeps the staff motivated and engaged:

Not just a safe one, a kind environment, where you have fun, it's a family environment, you want the workplace to be a place where you enjoy coming, and this also benefits the company (I18).

Moreover, a positive and hospitable working environment engages particularly frontline staff to work more effectively, and therefore they can share more easily these values and become brand ambassadors of the hospitableness:

To feel they then can then share our values and that becomes a natural, very natural instinctive part of what their reason is to come to work (I21).

Actions beneficial to employees are important for lifestyle and family businesses, for expressing the hospitableness through an engaged staff who trust the organisation. Intrinsic motivators are more powerful than extrinsic ones in influencing restaurant staff's productivity and gaining their support for further SBSR actions (Harris, et al., 2017; Jung et al., 2018).

Another way to engage the staff was to support them to engage in voluntary activities:

For example, we put some money aside and all the staff does a 5k or a 10k together, the money from that goes to a charity, we usually support local ones so that we support people in the local area (I2).

Allowing the staff to express themselves at work is key to engagement (Glavas, 2016). Some of these small foodservice businesses offer value-added attributes to their products, such as environmental, ethical or health aspects. The business motivation here is branding, as the added value offered by the product creates positive brand perceptions about the business:

Well it's the advantage to the brand... some things we just do them because we like to do what we do, but also people buy into that because they share the same values with us (I14).

Branding based on offering ethical, local or environmental products, or having healthy products that improve clients' well-being, is a useful business strategy (Britt & Frandsen, 2011) as it positively influences clients' trust and loyalty:

We believe it increases people confidence on us to know that we don't waste and we do everything fresh (I8).

This study shows empirically how this focus on healthy or ethical foods can provide a successful strategy for small niche foodservice businesses that wish to create trust among their clients as, by responding to their clients' growing interest in healthy, authentic and sustainable food (British Hospitality, 2017; Hall & Gossling, 2013), these small foodservice businesses can promote loyalty through reputation and branding. The CSR literature in chain restaurants similarly states that the trust and commitment of consumers moderates the effect of CSR on their loyalty to the restaurant (Kim, et al., 2013; Kim & Han, 2010; Kim & Kim, 2017) or coffee chain (Jang, et al., 2015), rather than influencing the financial outcomes (Jang, et al., 2017).

Actions aimed at the local community, such as creating community spaces, offering local food and protecting the environment, are further influenced by the business motive of increasing the goodwill and reputation of the business, particularly those actions related to

philanthropy:

People would think it's friendly, hopefully quite generous, it's about the reputation...I give vouchers for local charities (I11).

Here, it was found that a small cultural business like the foodservice one can capitalize in the long term on its intrinsic hospitableness, as expressed through care for the wellbeing of its employees, clients and local community, as such actions improve the relationships with these stakeholders. The implication of this last section makes an important contribution to hospitality theory, as it empirically demonstrates how hospitableness, expressed through SBSR actions, can help small businesses to manage their relationships more effectively, as proposed theoretically by authors exploring the attitudes of hospitality employees (Lashley, 2017; Lashley & Chibili, 2018). The section also contributes to SBSR theory by demonstrating that SBSR actions add intangible value to small businesses in the long term (Memili, Fang, Koç, & Sonmez, 2017). This confirms that small foodservice businesses are focused on being hospitable, primarily because of the personal values of the owner-managers; as a consequence, business benefits are not the primary motivation for implementing SBSR actions but can enhance business relationships in the long term.

Conclusion

This qualitative interpretivist study examined the personal values of the owner-managers of 24 small lifestyle and family foodservice businesses, with regard to the hospitableness of the business and SBSR. The findings show that these businesses express their hospitableness through SBSR actions, as the small business owners see their role as fulfilling the socio-emotional needs of all of the actors involved in the hospitality exchange, beyond the economic exchange of food and drink (Brotherton, 1999; Lugosi, 2009; Lynch, et al., 2011;

Wood, 2017; Brotherton, 2017). Hospitableness is expressed through SBSR actions that are beneficial not only to the guests but also other closest business relationships, such as the employees and members of the local community. The second finding is that, for these lifestyle and family businesses, it is personal values, such as moral norms, altruism, friendliness or a passion for food, that influence the hospitableness and SBSR. Some of these values are other-oriented, such as moral norms or altruism, while others are more self-directed, as they contribute to the self-actualization of the entrepreneur. This is a typical trait of small independent businesses, which focus on autonomy and independence. The resulting SBSR is a way to express and construct the hospitableness of the business, by sharing values with others. The SBSR is also highly influenced by the premises of the business and the local culture that it represents. The third finding focuses on the actual business benefits that further encourage SBSR implementation. In the long term, the proactive SBSR actions expressing the hospitableness, add intangible value to the business itself, as sharing values allows the business to build stronger relationships.

The study highlighted how small foodservice businesses, in a rapidly changing business environment (British Hospitality, 2017), might thrive through offering a mix of commercial, personalised and social hospitality (Gehrels, et al., 2017), by expressing their hospitableness through SBSR actions. This study is not generalisable to the whole population of small foodservice businesses, as it focuses specifically on family or lifestyle businesses. It rather suggests that those businesses which focus on the socialised value of hospitality are genuinely more committed to SBSR, because their hospitableness is focused on the wellbeing of others. It is posited that further studies should focus on the how the owner-managers can share the hospitableness across the business, particularly with employees. Such studies would be crucial, as it is employees who carry out SBSR actions; therefore, engaging employees in the hospitableness of the business, would further support SBSR actions that advance the

sustainability agenda in hospitality (Cavagnaro, et al., 2018; Rheede & Dekker, 2016) and that help the small business thrive (Gehrels, et al., 2017).

References

- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 932-968.
- Alonso-Almeida, M. d. M., Bagur-Femenias, L., Llach, J., & Perramon, J. (2018). Sustainability in small tourist businesses: The link between initiatives and performance. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(1), 1-20.
- Ateljevic, I., & Doorne, S. (2000). 'Staying within the fence': Lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(5), 378-392.
- Baumann-Pauly, D., Wickert, C., Spence, L. J., & Scherer, A. G. (2013). Organizing corporate social responsibility in small and large firms: Size matters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(4), 693-705.
- Baumann-Pauly, D., Wickert, C., Spence, L. & Scherer, A. (2013). Organizing Corporate Social Responsibility in Small and Large Firms: Size Matters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115, 693-705.
- Berrone, P., Cruz, C., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2012). Socioemotional wealth in family firms: Theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for future research. *Family Business Review*, 25(3), 258-279.
- Blain, M., & Lashley, C. (2014). Hospitableness: the new service metaphor? Developing an instrument for measuring hosting. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 4(1 & 2), 1-8.
- Bosworth, G. & Willett, J. (2011). Embeddedness or escapism? Rural perceptions and economic development in Cornwall and Northumberland. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 51(2), 195-214.
- Brammer, S., Pavelin, S. and Porter, L. (2009). Corporate charitable giving, multinational companies and countries of concern. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 575-96.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- British Hospitality (2014). *Sizzling with Success. FSM Driving Dynamic and Responsible Growth*. London: British Hospitality Association.
- British Hospitality (2017). *Leading through unprecedented change and uncertainty. FSM market Report 2017*. London: British Hospitality Association.
- Britt, J. W., Frandsen, K. & Leng, K. (2011). Feasibility of Voluntary Menu Labeling Among Locally Owned Restaurants. *Health Promotion Practice*, 12(1), 18-24.
- Brotherton, B. (1999). Towards a definitive view of the nature of hospitality and hospitality management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(4), 165-173.
- Brotherton, B. (2016). Hospitality—a synthetic approach. In *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (pp. 98-114). Routledge.
- Brown, D. J., & King, J. B. (1982). Small business ethics: Influences and perceptions. *Journal of Small Business Management (pre-1986)*, 20(1), 11.
- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2015). *Business Research Methods*. Fourth ed. Oxford: Oxford
- Buchholz, R. A., & Rosenthal, S. B. (2005). The spirit of entrepreneurship and the qualities of moral decision making: Toward a unifying framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60(3), 307-315.

- Cambra-Fierro, J., Hart, S. & Polo-Redondo, Y. (2008). Environmental respect: ethics or simply business? A study in the small and medium enterprise (SME) context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 645–656.
- Carasuk, R., Becken, S. & Hughey, K. F. D. (2016). Exploring Values, Drivers, and Barriers as Antecedents of Implementing Responsible Tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(1), 19–36.
- Carlsen, J., Morrison, A. & Weber, P. (2008). Lifestyle oriented small tourism firms. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 150-159.
- Carrigan, M., Lazell, J., Bosangit, C. & Solon, M. (2017). Burgers for tourists who give a damn! Driving disruptive social change upstream and downstream in the tourist food supply chain. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(11), 1563-1582.
- Carroll, A. (1991). The pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Towards the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons*, 34, 39-48.
- Cassell, C. & Symon, G. (2004). *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*. London: SAGE.
- Castka, P., Balzarova, M. A., Bamber, C. J., & Sharp, J. M. (2004). How can SMEs effectively implement the CSR agenda? A UK case study perspective. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 11(3), 140-149.
- Cavagnaro, E. (2017). Creating value for all: sustainability in hospitality. In *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (pp. 377-388). Routledge.
- Cavagnaro, E., Düweke, A., & Melissen, F. (2018). The host-guest relationship is the key to sustainable hospitality: Lessons learned from a Dutch case study. *Hospitality & Society*, 8(1), 23-44.
- Chen, S. C., & Elston, J. A. (2013). Entrepreneurial motives and characteristics: An analysis of small restaurant owners. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35, 294-305.
- Coles, T., Fenclova, E. & Dinan, C. (2013). Tourism and corporate social responsibility: A critical review and research agenda. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6, 122–141.
- Courrent, J. M., & Gundolf, K. (2009). Proximity and micro-enterprise manager’s ethics: A French empirical study of responsible business attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(4), 749-762.
- Curran, J. (2000). What is small business policy in the UK for? evaluation and assessing small business policies. *International Small Business Journal*, 18(3), 36-50.
- Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How Corporate Social Responsibility is Defined: an Analysis of 37 Definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15, 1-13.
- Demirtas, O., Hannah, S. T. & Gok, K. (2017). The Moderated Influence of Ethical Leadership, Via Meaningful Work, on Followers’ Engagement, Organizational Identification, and Envy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 145(1), 183–199.
- Derrida, J. (2000). Hostipitality. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*, 5(3), 3-18.
- Di Domenico, M., & Lynch, P. (2007). Commercial home enterprises: Identity, space and setting. In *Hospitality: A social lens* (pp. 131-142). Routledge.
- Di Pietro, R. B. (2017). Restaurant and foodservice research: A critical reflection behind and an optimistic look ahead. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 1203-1234.
- Di Pietro, R. B., & Levitt, J. (2017). Restaurant authenticity: Factors that influence perception, satisfaction and return intentions at regional American-style restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1-27.
- Doh, J. P. & Guay, T. R. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility, Public Policy, and NGO Activism in Europe and the United States: An Institutional-Stakeholder Perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(1), 47-73.
- Eat Sheffield, 2012. *Eat Sheffield 2012 Award Categories*, Sheffield: Internal Document.

- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Estrade, M., Dick, S. & Crawford, F. (2014). A qualitative study of independent fast food vendors near secondary schools in disadvantaged Scottish neighbourhoods. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 793-801.
- European Commission. Directorate-General for Employment. (2001). *Promoting a European Framework for Corporate Social Responsibility: Green Paper*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurostat, S. E., 2016. Food and beverage services statistics - NACE Rev. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained> - Accessed 23/07/2016.
- Farrington, T., Curran, R., Gori, K., O’Gorman, K. D., & Queenan, C. J. (2017). Corporate social responsibility: reviewed, rated, revised. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 30-47.
- Fassin, Y., Werner, A., Van Rossem, A., Signori, S., Garriga, E., von Weltzien Hoivik, H., & Schlierer, H. J. (2015). CSR and related terms in SME owner–managers’ mental models in six European countries: National context matters. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(2), 433-456.
- Fenwick, T. (2010). Learning to practice social responsibility in small business: challenges and conflicts. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 1(1), 149-169.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Garay, L. & Font, X. (2012). Doing good to do well? Corporate social responsibility reasons, practices and impacts in small and medium accommodation enterprises. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 329– 337.
- Garriga, E. & Mele, D. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 51–71.
- Gehrels, S., Lashley, C., & Cavagnaro, E. (2017). Academy of International Hospitality Research (AIHR) Conference, 11–12 April 2017: Innovation in Hospitality—an overview. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 7(1), 1-3.
- Getz, D., Carlsen, J. & Morrison, A. (2004). *The Family Business in Tourism and Hospitality*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Getz, D. & Petersen, T. (2005). Growth and profit-oriented entrepreneurship among family business owners in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Hospitality Management*, 24, 219–242.
- Gilmore, J. H. & Pine, J. (2007). *Authenticity: What Consumers Really Want*. Boston: Harvard Business Review.
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 796.
- Hall, C. M. & Gossling, S. (2013). *Sustainable culinary systems: Local foods, innovation, tourism and hospitality*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hammann, E.-M., Habisch, A. & Pechla, H. (2009). Values that create value: socially responsible business practices in SMEs – empirical evidence from German companies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 18(1), 37-51.
- Harris, K. J., Murphy, K. S. & Di Pietro, R.B. (2017). The antecedents and outcomes of food safety motivators for restaurant workers: An expectancy framework. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 63(5), 53-62.
- Hawkins, R. & Bohdanowicz, P. (2012). *Responsible hospitality: theory and practice*. London: Goodfellow.
- Hemmington, N. (2007). From service to experience: Understanding and defining the hospitality business. *The Service Industries Journal*, 27(6), 747-755.

- Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Moskwa, E. & Wijesinghe, G. (2017). How sustainable is sustainable hospitality research? A review of sustainable restaurant literature from 1991 to 2015. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-30.
- Hillary, R. (2004). Environmental management systems and the smaller enterprise. *Journal of cleaner production*, 12(6), 561-569.
- Inoue, Y., & Lee, S. (2011). Effects of different dimensions of corporate social responsibility on corporate financial performance in tourism-related industries. *Tourism Management*, 32(4), 790-804.
- Jamali, D., Zanhour, M. & Keshishian, T. (2009). Peculiar strengths and relational attributes of SMEs in the context of CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87(3), 355-377.
- Jang, Y. J., Kim, W. G. & Lee, H. Y. (2015). Coffee shop consumers' emotional attachment and loyalty to green stores: The moderating role of green consciousness. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 44, 146-156.
- Jang, Y. J., Zheng, T. & Bosselman, R. (2017). Top managers' environmental values, leadership, and stakeholder engagement in promoting environmental sustainability in the restaurant industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 63(5), 101-111.
- Jenkins, H. (2004). A Critique of Conventional CSR Theory: An SME Perspective. *Journal of General Management*, 29(4), 37-57.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). Small Business Champions for Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 241-256.
- Johanson, M. M., & Woods, R. H. (2008). Recognizing the emotional element in service excellence. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(3), 310-316.
- Jones, P., Hillier, D. & Comfort, D. (2014). Sustainability in the global hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 5-17.
- Jones, P., Hillier, D. & Comfort, D. (2016). Sustainability in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 36-67.
- Jung, S., Kim, JH., Kang, KH., & Kim, B. (2018), Internationalization and corporate social responsibility in the restaurant industry: risk perspective, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-19.
- Kang, K. H., Lee, S. & Huh, C. (2010). Impacts of positive and negative corporate social responsibility activities on company performance in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 72-82.
- Keen, N. Z. D. (2013). The interaction of community and small tourism businesses in rural New Zealand. In *Small Firms in Tourism* (pp. 149-162). Routledge.
- Kim, Y. & Han, H. (2010). Intention to pay conventional-hotel prices at a green hotel—a modification of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(8), 997-1014.
- Kim, D. J. & Kim, L. H., (2017). Achieving relational outcomes in casual dining restaurants through consumer commitment. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(2), 178-203.
- Kim, Y. J., Njite, D. & Hancer, M. (2013). Anticipated emotion in consumers' intentions to select eco-friendly restaurants: Augmenting the theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 255- 262.
- King, C. (1995). What is hospitality? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14(3/4), 219-234.
- Kobeissi, N. (2009). Impact of the community reinvestment act on new business start-ups and economic growth in local markets. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 47, 489-513.
- Lashley, C. (2007). Discovering hospitality: observations from recent research. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(3), 214-226.
- Lashley, C. (2008). Studying hospitality: insights from social sciences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(1), 69-84.

- Lashley, C. (2014). Insights into the morality of hospitality. *Hospitality & Society*, 4(1), 3-7.
- Lashley, C. (2015). Hospitality and hospitableness. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Lashley, C. (2016). Corporate social responsibility – emancipating wage slaves. *Hospitality & Society*, 6(1), 3-7.
- Lashley, C. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of Hospitality Studies*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Lashley, C. & Chibili, M., (2018), 27th Council for Hospitality Management Education (CHME) Annual Research Conference, Bornemouth.
- Lashley, C. & Morrison, A. (2013). *In Search of Hospitality*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Lashley, C. & Rowson, B. (2010). Lifestyle businesses: Insights into Blackpool's hotel sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 511-519.
- Lee-Ross, D. & Lashley, C. (2010). *Entrepreneurship and small business management in the hospitality industry*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Lee, S. & Heo, C. Y. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and customer satisfaction among US publicly traded hotels and restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 635–637.
- Lepoutre, J. & Heene, A. (2006). Investigating the Impact of Firm Size on Small Business Social Responsibility: A Critical Review. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 257–273.
- Lockett, A., Moon, J. & Visser, W. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility in Management Research: Focus, Nature, Salience and Sources of Influence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43, 115-136.
- Lugosi, P. (2008). Hospitality Spaces, Hospitable Moments: Consumer Encounters and Affective Experiences in Commercial Settings. *Journal of Foodservice*, 19(2), 139–49.
- Lugosi, P. (2009). The production of hospitable space: Commercial propositions and consumer co-creation in a bar operation. *Space and Culture*, 12(4), 396-411.
- Lugosi, P., Lynch, P. & Morrison, A. (2009). Critical hospitality management research. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(10), 1465-1478.
- Lynch, P., Molz, J. G., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P., & Lashley, C. (2011). Theorizing hospitality. *Hospitality & Society*, 1(1), 3-24.
- Matten, D. & Crane, A. (2005). Corporate Citizenship: Toward an Extended Theoretical Conceptualization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 166-179.
- Matten, D. & Moon, J. (2008). “Implicit” and “explicit” CSR: a conceptual framework for a comparative understanding of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 404–424.
- Memili, E., Fang, H., Koç, B. & Sonmez, S. (2017). Sustainability practices of family firms: the interplay between family ownership and long-term orientation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-20.
- Mencl, J., and May, D. R. (2009). The Effects of Proximity and Empathy on Ethical Decision-Making: An Exploratory Investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, 201-226.
- Midttun, A., Gautesen, K., & Gjøølberg, M. (2006). The political economy of CSR in Western Europe. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 6(4), 369-385.
- Morrison, A. & Thomas, R. (1999). The future of small firms in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(4), 148-154.
- Moskwa, E., Higgins-Desbiolles, F. & Gifford, S. (2015). Sustainability through food and conversation: the role of an entrepreneurial restaurateur in fostering engagement with sustainable development issues. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(1), 126-145.
- Murrillo, D. & Lozano, J. (2006). SMEs and CSR: An approach to CSR according to their own words. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3, 227–240.

- Nicholson, J. D., LaPlaca, P., Al-Abdin, A., Breese, R., & Khan, Z. (2018). What do introduction sections tell us about the intent of scholarly work: A contribution on contributions. *Industrial Marketing Management*.
- Njite, D., Hancer, M. & Slevitch, L. (2011). Exploring Corporate Social Responsibility: A Managers' Perspective on How and Why Small Independent Hotels Engage with Their Communities. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(3), 177-201.
- O'Gorman, K. D. (2007). The hospitality phenomenon: philosophical enlightenment? *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(3), 189-202.
- Okoye, A. (2009). Theorising Corporate Social Responsibility as an Essentially Contested Concept: Is a Definition Necessary? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 613–627.
- O'Mahony, B. (2003). Social and domestic forces in commercial hospitality provision: A view from Australia. *Hospitality Review*, 5(4), 37-42.
- Orlitzky, M., Siegel, D. & Waldman, D. (2011). Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Sustainability. *Business Society*, 50(1), 6–27.
- Örtenblad, A. (2016). *Research handbook on corporate social responsibility in context*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Parsa, H., Lord, K., Putrevu, S. & Kreeger, J. (2015). Corporate social and environmental responsibility in services: Will consumers pay for it? *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 22, 250–260.
- Perrini, F. (2006). SMEs and CSR Theory: Evidence and implications from an Italian perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 305-316.
- Perrini, F., Russo, A. & Tencati, A. (2007). CSR strategies of SMEs and large firms. Evidence from Italy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 285–300.
- Poulston, J. & Yiu, A. Y. K. (2011). Profit or principles: Why do restaurants serve organic food? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30, 184–191.
- Poulston, J. (2015), Expressive labour and the gift of hospitality, *Hospitality & Society*, 5 (2-3), 145-165.
- Power, S., Di Domenico ML., Miller, G., (2017), The nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 65, 36–48.
- Quinn, J. J. (1997). Personal ethics and business ethics: The ethical attitudes of owner/managers of small business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(2), 119-127.
- Ram, M., Marlow, S. & Patton, D. (2001). Managing the locals: employee relations in South Asian restaurants. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 13(1), 229-245.
- Revell, A. & Rutherford, R. (2003). UK environmental policy and the small firm: broadening the focus. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 12, 26–35.
- Revell, A., Stokes, D. & Chen, H. (2010). Small Businesses and the Environment: Turning over a new leaf? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 19, 273-288.
- Rheede, A. van and Dekker, D. M. (2016), Hospitableness and sustainable development: New responsibilities and demands in the host-guest relationship, *Research in Hospitality Management*, 6:1, 77–81.
- Rimington, M. & Spencer, P. (2008). *Regional Suppliers to Independent Restaurants in Sheffield*, Sheffield: Centre for International Hospitality Management Research, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Ritzer, G. (2015). Hospitality and prosumption. *Research in Hospitality*, 5(1), 9-17.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, Free Press.
- Sampaio, A., Thomas, R. & Font, X. (2012). Small business management and environmental engagement. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(2), 179-193.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2017). *Research methods for business students*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

- Schaefer, A., Williams, S., Blundel, R., (2018), Individual Values and SME Environmental Engagement, *Business & Society*, 1-34.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.
- Silverman, D. (2015). *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London: Sage.
- Soundararajan, V., Jamali, D. & Spence, L. (2017). Small Business Social Responsibility: A Critical Multilevel Review, Synthesis and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1–23.
- Spence, L. (1999). Does size matter? The state of the art in small business ethics. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 8, 163-174.
- Spence, L. (2016). Small Business Social Responsibility: Expanding Core CSR Theory. *Business Society*, 1-33.
- Spence, L. J. & Perrini, F. (2009). Practice and politics: Ethics and social responsibility in SME in the European Union. *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(2), 20-31.
- Spence, L. & Schmidpeter, R. (2003). SMEs, Social Capital and the Common Good. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(1-2), 93–108.
- Sweeney, M., Docherty-Hughes, J. & Lynch, P. (2018). Lifestyling entrepreneurs' sociological expressionism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 69, 90–100.
- Tasci, A. D. A. & Semrad, K. J. (2016). Developing a scale of hospitableness: A tale of two worlds. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 30-41.
- Telfer, E. (1995). Hospitableness. *Philosophy Papers*, 24(3), 183-196.
- Telfer, E. (2012). *Food for Thought: Philosophy and Food*. London: Routledge.
- Telfer, E. (2017). The philosophy of hospitableness. In *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (pp. 57-68). Routledge.
- THESRA, 2013. *Summary consumer attitude report 2013*, London: Sustainable Restaurant Association.
- Thomas, R., Shaw, G. & Page, S. J., 2011. Understanding small firms in tourism: A perspective on research trends and challenges. *Tourism Management*, 32, 963-976.
- Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., Gibson, D. G., & Toffler, B. L. (1999). Managing ethics and legal compliance: What works and what hurts. *California Management Review*, 41(2), 131-151.
- Tomasella, B., & Ali, A. (2016), A pluralistic framework for the analysis of corporate social responsibility and its application to small and medium enterprises, British Academy of Management conference: Thriving in Turbulent times, Newcastle Business School, Newcastle.
- Tzschentke, N., Kirk, D. & Lynch, P. (2008). Going green: Decisional factors in small hospitality operations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 126–133.
- Velvin, I., Bjørnstad, K. & Krogh, E. (2016). Social value change, embeddedness and social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 10(3), 262-280.
- von Weltzien Høivik, H. & Shankar, D. (2011). How Can SMEs in a Cluster Respond to Global Demands for Corporate Responsibility? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101, 175–195.
- Waligo, V., Clarke, J. & Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: a multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, 36, 342-353.
- Waller, V., Farquharson, K., & Dempsey, D. (2016). *Qualitative social research: contemporary methods for the digital age*. London: Sage.

- Wheeler, D., Colbert, B. & Freeman, E. (2003). Focusing on Value: Reconciling Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainability and a Stakeholder Approach in a Network World. *Journal of General Management*, 28(3), 1-28.
- Wickert, C., Scherer, A. G. & Spence, L. (2016). Walking and Talking Corporate Social Responsibility: Implications of Firm Size and Organizational Cost. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(7), 1169-1196.
- Williamson, D., Lynch-Wood, G. & Ramsay, J. (2006). Drivers of environmental behavior in manufacturing SMEs and the implications for CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 317–330.
- Windsor, D. (2001). The future of corporate social responsibility. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9(3), 225-256.
- Wood, R. (2017). Sociological perspectives on hospitality. In *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (pp. 78-97). Routledge.
- Brotherton, B., & Wood, R. C. (2008). The nature and meanings of “hospitality.” In *The SAGE handbook of hospitality management* (pp. 37-61). SAGE.
- Wry, T. (2009). Does Business and Society Scholarship Matter to Society? Pursuing a Normative Agenda with Critical Realism and Neoinstitutional Theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 151–171.